



• **UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,981	01/04/2002	Maria Trinidad Martinez Beltran	32944-00050USPT TXM 01:03	9518
7590	04/22/2004		EXAMINER	
			ELAHEE, MD S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2645		W

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/038,981	BELTRAN ET AL.
	Examiner Md S Elahee	Art Unit 2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 21-28 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 21-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 02/02/04. Claims 1 and 21-28 are pending. Claims 2-20 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 21-28 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindquist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,660) and in view of Khadri et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0196779).

Regarding claim 1, Lindquist teaches a method for routing a signaling message in a telecommunication network, wherein the telecommunication network includes a first SS7 telecommunications network (i.e., first licensed operator network) and second SS7 telecommunications network (i.e., second licensed operator network), the first SS7

telecommunications network including a gateway (i.e., first Border Node), adjacent to the second SS7 telecommunications network (abstract; fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 41-51).

However, Lindquist fails to teach “a second Border Node of the second licensed operator network”. Khadri teaches a SP node 114 (i.e., second Border Node) of the Italian network 268 (i.e., second licensed operator network) (fig.3; page 4, paragraph 0040). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lindquist to have a second Border Node of the second licensed operator network as taught by Khadri. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to route messages to the Italian network.

Lindquist further teaches providing a first numbering plan for use by the first SS7 telecommunications network, wherein the first numbering plan specifies the Point Codes used in the first SS7 telecommunications network (fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

Lindquist further teaches providing a second numbering plan for use by the second SS7 telecommunications network wherein the second numbering plan specifies the Point Codes used in the second SS7 telecommunications network (fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

However, Lindquist fails to teach “the first and second numbering plans use a same Point Code configuration numbering_plan”. Khadri teaches the first and second numbering plans use a same ITU-N point code of 249 (i.e., Point Code configuration numbering_plan) (fig.3; page 4, paragraph 0040). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lindquist to have the first and second numbering plans using a same Point Code configuration numbering_plan as taught by Khadri. The motivation for the

modification is to have doing so in order to route signaling messages between signaling networks wherein the same network point code is used in more than one of the signaling networks.

Lindquist further teaches receiving at the gateway the signaling message comprising an Originating Point Code (OPC) and a Destination Point Code (DPC) in accordance with the first numbering plan (fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

Lindquist further teaches mapping the OPC and the DPC of the signaling message from the first to the second numbering plan (abstract; fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

Lindquist further teaches delivering the signaling message from the gateway to a destination node of the telecommunication network according to the mapped OPC and DPC (fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

Regarding claim 21, Lindquist teaches that method is performed using Signaling System 7 (SS7/C7) protocol (fig.5, fig.6; col.4, lines 46-63, col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

Regarding claim 22, Lindquist teaches receiving the signaling message is performed in a Message Transfer Part (MTP) of the first gateway (fig.6; col.6, line 42).

Regarding claim 23, Lindquist fails to teach “the Border Node is a Signaling Transfer Point or a Signaling End Point”. Khadri teaches that the SP node 114 (i.e., Border Node) is a Signaling Transfer Point or a Signaling End Point (fig.3; page 4, paragraph 0040). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lindquist to have the Border Node being a Signaling Transfer Point or a Signaling End Point as taught by Khadri. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to route messages to the Italian network.

Regarding claim 24, Lindquist teaches that the signaling message is an outgoing signaling message or an incoming signaling message (fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

Regarding claims 25 and 27, Lindquist further teaches that checking in the MTP of the gateway if the Link Set associated toward the destination node supports MTP Point Code Mapping (fig.1, fig.2, fig.5, fig.6; col.4, lines 46-63, col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54; ‘gateway’ reads on the claim ‘Border Node’ and ‘first SS7 telecommunications network’ reads on the claim ‘first licensed operator network’).

Lindquist further teaches extracting the OPC and the DPC from the signaling message (fig.1, fig.2, fig.5, fig.6; col.4, lines 46-63, col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

Lindquist further teaches selecting an MTP Point Code conversion table associated to the Link Set (fig.1, fig.2, fig.5, fig.6; col.4, lines 46-63, col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54; ‘conversion table’ reads on the claim ‘Mapping Table’).

Lindquist further teaches performing a mapping in the MTP of the gateway of the OPC to an alias OPC (abstract; fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54; ‘gateway’ reads on the claim ‘Border Node’).

Lindquist further teaches performing a mapping in the MTP of the gateway, of the DPC to an actual DPC of the destination node (abstract; fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

Lindquist further teaches replacing the OPC by the alias OPC and the DPC to the actual DPC, wherein the alias OPC and the actual DPC are known in the second SS7 telecommunications network (abstract; fig.5, fig.6; col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54).

Regarding claims 26 and 28, Lindquist teaches that the Link Set has associated therewith a conversion table (fig.1, fig.2, fig.5, fig.6; col.4, lines 46-63, col.6, lines 19-35, 51-54; ‘conversion table’ reads on the claim ‘Mapping Point Code Table’).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Madoch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,111) teach Method of aggregating a plurality of network traffic and Gottlieb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,822) teach Method of and system for call routing compliant with international regulatory routing requirements.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2645

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [shafiulalam.elahhee@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-5397(for formal communications intended for entry; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

(703)**306-5406**(for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be

Art Unit: 2645

discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or hand-carried to:

Crystal Park Two

2121 Crystal Drive

Arlington, VA.

Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

M. E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE

April 17, 2004

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

